

Appl. No. : 10/790,987
Filed : March 2, 2004

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, Claims 1-5, 7-21, 23-28, 34 and 35 remain pending. Claims 6, 22 and 29-33 have been canceled without prejudice and Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in a continuation application. New Claims 34 and 35 have been added. Claims 1, 8, 14, 15, 20, 21 and 28 have been amended.

Objection to Claims

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's statement that Claims 6, 8, 14-19, 22, 23 and 27 "would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to incorporate the recitations of dependent Claim 6. Applicant has also amended Claims 8, 14 and 15 to incorporate into each the recitations of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are in condition for immediate allowance. New Claims 34 and 35 depend from amended Claim 1 and are therefore likewise in condition for immediate allowance.

Applicants have amended Claim 21 to incorporate the recitations of dependent Claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 21 and 23-28 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 as being indefinite.

With respect to Claim 20, the Examiner states that the abbreviated PET is "indefinite absent a full chemical name and said PET (specie) is also one of the recited thermoplastic polyester (genus). Also the recited 'such as' is indefinite." Applicant has amended Claim 20 to remove the recitations "PET" and "such as polyvinylidene fluoride," and have added New Claims 34 and 35 to recite these features, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 20.

As to Claim 28, the Examiner states that the recited "the cross-linking" lacks antecedent basis. Applicant has amended Claim 28 to properly depend from Claim 27, which provides the necessary antecedent basis for "the cross-linking." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 28.

Appl. No. : 10/790,987
Filed : March 2, 2004

Rejection of The Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or §103

Claims 1-4, 7, 10-12 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, alternatively, under §103(a) as obvious over Plummer (US 6284809). Applicant respectfully submits these rejections are moot in view of the claim amendments discussed above.

Claims 1-3, 7, 9-13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, alternatively, under §103(a) as obvious over Morales (US 6235801). Applicant respectfully submits these rejections are moot in view of the claim amendments discussed above.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, alternatively, under §103(a) as obvious over Kolb (US 2002-0128336). Applicant respectfully submits these rejections are moot in view of the claim amendments discussed above.

Claims 1, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, alternatively, under §103(a) as obvious over Sagal (US 2004-0229035). Applicant respectfully submits these rejections are moot in view of the claim amendments discussed above.

Claims 1, 20, 21 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Sagal in view of Takekoshi (US 3833546). Applicant respectfully submits these rejections are moot in view of the claim amendments discussed above.

Claims 1-3 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, alternatively, under §103(a) as obvious over Stender (US 2004-0102573). Applicant respectfully submits these rejections are moot in view of the claim amendments discussed above.

Claims 1, 7, 10-12 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, alternatively, under §103(a) as obvious over Tobita (US 6652058). Applicant respectfully submits these rejections are moot in view of the claim amendments discussed above.

Claims 1-4, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Baumgaertner (US 3847888) or Salatiello (US 3434996). Applicant respectfully submits these rejections are moot in view of the claim amendments discussed above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully traverse each of the Examiner's rejections and each of the Examiner's assertions regarding what the prior art shows or teaches, even if not expressly discussed herein. Although changes to the claims have been made, no acquiescence, disclaimer or estoppel is intended or should be implied thereby; such amendments are made only to expedite prosecution of the

Appl. No. : 10/790,987
Filed : March 2, 2004

present application and are without prejudice to the presentation or assertion, in the future, of claims relating to the same or similar subject matter. The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' attorney in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: March 13, 2007

By: 

Josué A. Villalta
Registration No. 54,511
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(951) 781-9231

AMEND

3526827_1
031307